

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 7, and 12. Claims 1-16 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action,<sup>1</sup> the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,041,413 to Wang ("Wang"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

In order to properly establish that Wang anticipates Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully submit that Wang fails to teach each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination including, for example, "information representing whether activation of the electronic device is inhibited." Wang fails to disclose at least this element of claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to allege that the password information in Wang is a teaching of the claimed "information representing whether activation of the electronic device is inhibited."

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

However, the Examiner's allegation is incorrect. As recited in claim 1, the claimed "switch, when turned on, . . . sets the information to inhibit the activation of the electronic device." That is, the claimed "information" always represents that the activation of the electronic device is inhibited when the switch is turned on. Therefore, even if an application program of the claimed "electronic device" issues an "activation instruction," the claimed "electronic device" cannot be activated when the switch is turned on.

Wang, however, teaches that the password information is used for password authentication. The result of the password authentication (i.e., password matching signal PM in Fig. 3 of Wang) is a component of the information to determine whether the electronic device is to be activated or not, and affects the activation thereof. Specifically, whether or not the electronic device is to be activated is determined based on the result of the password authentication and/or a main switch status (MSW) signal. See, e.g., Wang, col. 8, lines 8-37.

For example, according to Wang, if the result of the password authentication is positive (successful) and the main switch status MSW signal is not positive, the electronic device cannot be activated. This means that the electronic device cannot be activated even if an application program issues an activation instruction when the main switch status MSW is not turned on. Therefore, the password information of Wang represents that the activation of the electronic device is inhibited even when the switch is turned off.

In contrast, according to Applicants' claimed invention, if the claimed "information" is set to activate the electronic device by the switch being off (i.e.,

activation of the electronic device is not inhibited) and the application program issues the activation instruction, the claimed “electronic device” is activated.

Therefore, according to Applicants’ claimed invention, the claimed “information” is used for determining “whether the activation of the electronic device is inhibited” and the claimed “switch” is used for setting the claimed “information.” This is contrary to Wang’s disclosure.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Wang does not disclose “information representing whether activation of the electronic device is inhibited,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Wang fails to anticipate claim 1.

Furthermore, independent claims 7, 12, 13, and 16, although different in scope from claim 1, recite elements similar to those of claim 1. Therefore, Wang fails to anticipate claims 7, 12, 13, and 16 for at least reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 14, and 15 are allowable over Wang at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims 1, 7, and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge  
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 20, 2007

By: Richard V. Burgujian  
*for* Richard V. Burgujian  
Reg. No. 31,744